

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciatively note that claims 6, 16, 17, 18, and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully request this be held in abeyance pending allowance of the independent claim 1.

Claims 1-5, 7-15 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Langner et al. (US Patent No. 6,867,711) in view of Briffe et al. (US Patent No. 6,057,786) and Factor (US Patent No. 6,281,810). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is patentable over the applied art of record at least because the applied art of record, individually or in combination thereof, fails to disclose or suggest all of the claimed limitations of independent claim 1, in particular, the two items of equipment have at least two operating modes, one of the modes being an integrated standby data display mode and the other being a mode of displaying the automatic pilot set points given by the pilot, the items of equipment each operating in a different mode in normal operating conditions.

Langer discloses a cockpit panel system, which includes a multifunction display. The multifunction display includes a bezel having control buttons thereon that are adapted for controlling display format, communication, navigation and sensors.

Langer fails to disclose or suggest all of the claimed features of claim 1, such as, standby display equipment and automatic pilot control equipment. Based on the teaching of the Background section of Langer, it is clear that Langer aims at providing a cockpit display which eliminates the trouble for a pilot to view scattered, multiple displays. Thus, Langer is irrelevant to a standby display equipment and an automatic pilot control equipment each comprises a display screen capable of displaying the integrated standby data. In addition, although Langer mentions “autopilot controls 135” as an additional input, the “autopilot controls 135” are actually a set of control buttons integrated in the bezel 100. Nowhere does Langer disclose an automatic

pilot control equipment which comprises a display screen capable of displaying the integrated standby data.

Langer further mentions that more than one MFD with a display and one or more controls may be used. However, none of those MFDs functions as automatic pilot control equipment. As disclosed by Langer, MFD 200/300 may includes following features: all features provide in PFD 100, controls of audio capabilities, navigational display, illustrating engine data (Line 32-67, Column 11; Line 5-63, Column 14), but these features of MFD 200/300 are not similar to the automatic pilot control equipment as claimed by claim 1.

Moreover, as admitted by the Examiner, Langer fails to disclose:

- A main display system for horizon and piloting parameters separate from the automatic pilot control equipment and standby display equipment
- Automatic pilot control equipment and standby display equipment each have two operating modes, one of the modes being an integrated standby data display mode and the other being a mode of displaying the automatic pilot set points given by the pilot, wherein each operate in a different mode in normal operating conditions

With respect to Briffe, a primary flight director and a head-up display are disclosed. Standby display equipment is mentioned in Briffe at column 4, line 7-14, but not in Figure 1. The specification of Briffe explicitly describes that standby instruments are **not shown** (Line 7, Column 4).

In absence of any detailed description or Figures corresponding to the standby display, Briffe does teach using standby instruments. Nevertheless, Briffe fails to disclose or suggest automatic pilot control equipment and standby display equipment each having two operating modes, one of the modes being an integrated standby data display mode and the other being a mode of displaying the automatic pilot set points given by the pilot, wherein each operate in a different mode in normal operating conditions.

In addition, the outstanding Office Action indicates that it would have been obvious to utilize a backup system to a primary system when problem occurs, wherein flight data is displayed and the pilot can control the aircraft. This assertion is deficient of convincing evidence

support, and also deviates from the claimed invention. The claimed invention is not restricted to simply using standby display equipment. Utilizing a backup system to display flight data and allowing pilot to control the aircraft is actually one of the technical results that are provided by the claimed aircraft panel. As claimed by claim 1 of the present application, the automatic pilot control equipment and standby display equipment are identical equipments each having two functions, i.e. standby and autopilot, and each of the equipments operates in one of the two functions. Therefore, Briffe fails to disclose or suggest all of the claimed features of claim 1 and claim 1 is not obvious in view of Briffe.

With respect to Factor, a redundant system is disclosed which includes one screens configured to display information provided by one of the two display device, and a toggle switch which allows selection of one display device. In fact, the system disclosed by Factor is merely a main display system, and image representative of data from the same sensor to be projected to the same location on the screen, regardless of which computer and image creation device provided and projected the image.

Thus, it is apparent that Factor fails to disclose or suggest a standby display equipment and an automatic pilot control equipment each comprises a display screen capable of displaying the integrated standby data, as well as the two operating modes of each standby display equipment and automatic pilot control equipment.

Thus, the applied art of record, individually or in combination, fails to disclose a automatic pilot control equipment and standby display equipment each have two operating modes, one of the modes being an integrated standby data display mode and the other being a mode of displaying the automatic pilot set points given by the pilot, wherein each operate in a different mode in normal operating conditions.

At least for the above reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5, 7-15 recite additional, important limitations and should be patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 as well as on their own merit. Accordingly, the obviousness rejection should be withdrawn.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP



Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: November 6, 2007
KMB/SY/bjs/jlb/cac